DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 108 722 JC 750 394

AUTHOR McIntyre, Chuck
TITLE Regulations for New Colleges.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento.
PUB DATE Jun 75
NOTE 15p.; Presented to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, June 18-19, 1975

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *College Planning; Community Surveys; Delivery Systems; Facility Planning; *Junior Colleges; Manpower Needs; *Master Plans; Policy Formation; Program Planning; State Legislation; *State Standards; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *California; Needs Assessment

ABSTRACT

This document proposes specific changes in the California Education Code which would prescribe minimum standards for the formation of public community colleges. The Code regulations would define "college", require the assessment of local needs and preferences before the establishment of a new college, provide objectives for the formation of new college programs and services, present criteria for selecting an appropriate delivery system, require districts to consider alternatives to new college construction for the delivery of the same programs and services, and recommend district identification of proposed sources of funding for both short- and long-term operations. In an appended paper, a state-level role and process for community college planning is proposed. A comprehensive five-year plan is proposed to provide the basis for the Board's legislative, capital outlay, and finance programs, and for apportionment and program allocation and review administration by the Chancellor's Office. This five-year plan would be developed by a Chancellor's Office Task Force, which would be responsible for analyzing all relevant information, identifying short-term and long-term problems, and recommending solutions and policy directions for approval by the Board. The content, time-schedule, and evaluation methods for a five-year plan are discussed. (DC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED108722

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Board of Governors of the
California Community Colleges
June 18-19, 1975

Item 3

Title. Regulations for New Colleges

Staff presentation: Chuck McIntyre, Director of Analytical Studies

Summary

1. The Board of Governors is required to establish minimum standards for use by district boards in forming Community Colleges.

2. This item presents, for Board consideration, Title 5 regulations that would establish such standards.

3. Related issues concerning the Board's role in planning and program review are also discussed.

Recommendations

1. The Chairman of the Board should declare a public hearing for testimony on the proposed regulations.

2. The Board should adopt the proposed Title 5 regulations establishing minimum standards for forming new Community Colleges.

JC 750 361

ABSTRACT

The Board of Governors has prescribed numerous minimum standards for college operation in carrying out its many Education Code responsibilities. The Board, however, has not prescribed minimum standards for district boards to use in forming new colleges. This item proposes Title 5 regulations for Board consideration to establish such standards for local use.

The suggested standards should be sufficiently general as to apply to the varying kinds of Community College service areas throughout the state. The standards are prescribed for use by local boards in deciding on college formation and, therefore, specify factors important to that decision: (a) the educational needs and preferences of individuals in the area to be served, (b) programs and services designed toward those needs and preferences, and (c) means of delivering and evaluating such programs and services. Uniform quantitative threshholds have been avoided in favor of more flexible considerations oriented to local decision-making. Presumably, a correct decision would result when the standards are rigorously applied to problems and conditions specific to the community service area.

Beyond prescribing minimum standards, the Code is silent about the Board's role in the local formation of new Community Colleges. Several factors suggest the Board should review and comment on local decisions to form new colleges and perhaps new campuses and off-campus centers as well. This role, however, must be consistent with the legal mandation to preserve local prerogatives in the management of California Community Colleges.

The Board must review and approve district facility and academic plans, programs and courses, along with administering State School Fund apportionments, Construction Act, and numerous other programs. Staff are designing an annual planning process, focusing on the development of a 5-year Community College plan, for Board consideration this fall. Board activities regarding new colleges, campuses, and off-campus centers could take place within this annual planning process.

Background

Tne Education Code requires the Board of Governors to establish minimum standards for use by district boards in forming Community Colleges. This item addresses this requirement by proposing Title 5 regulations for Board adoption. Establishing minimum standards is the primary objective of this item.

Current developments also suggest the need to clarify the Board role in review of new colleges, campuses, and possibly off-campus operations. This item, therefore, also discusses the Board's role in planning and program review particularly of local boards' decisions to form new campus and off-campus operations.

A possible state-level role in planning, now being reviewed for further refinements, is described in Appendix A.

Standards

The Board is specifically required to:

> "prescribe minimum standards for the formation and operation of public community colleges and exercise general supervision over public community colleges."

Numerous other Code sections are explicit about the Board's role in reviewing and approving plans, programs, courses, and facilities for colleges. Administration of these other sections appears to constitute the exercise of general supervision during which many minimum standards for college operation have been prescribed. Only those minimum standards for the formation of colleges remain to be prescribed by the Board.

Such standards may be:

(a) very specific or

(b) general;

descriptive of

(c) the character of college operations,

(d) factors important in deciding to form a new college, or

(e) both; and

applicable to

(f) campuses,

(g) off-campus operations, or

(h) both.

The unique character of each college service area suggests that the standards be sufficiently general as to apply throughout the state. Prescribed minimums that are too narrow or specific could well constrain innovative and effective means of providing educational services to a particular community.

By law, these standards are prescribed for use by local boards in deciding on college formation. Consequently, the standards should specify factors important to that decision:

(a) the educational needs and preferences of individuals in the area(s) to be served,

(b) programs and services designed toward those needs and preferences, and

(c) alternative means of delivering such programs and services.

Presumably, a correct decision would result when the standards had been rigorously applied: where educational needs and preferences are accurately quantified and qualified, programs and services designed to be relevant to those needs and preferences, and system(s) selected that most effectively and equitably deliver programs and services to students within the service area.

In this context, the minimum standards would comprehensively emphasize the full range of concerns relevant to planning new college operations, incorporating the anticipated character of college operations where necessary for selection of the best delivery system. In addition, college goals and objectives should be sufficiently specific that the success with which needs and preferences are met may be evaluated.

Most prior requests by Community College districts to establish new colleges have been accompanied by requests to begin the capital construction at a new campus. Consequently, the major decision criteria were those attendant to the state construction program, Education Code Sections 20050 through 20085, and the Board's role in approving new Community College academic programs, Education Code Section 199. Thus, given the appropriateness of Community College programs proposed, the major state level concern had to do with rapidly increasing total district enrollment and provision of sufficient physical facilities. It is clear that this planning mode is outdated. While growth continues, the major problem is not to anticipate explosive growth as in the 1960's, but rather anticipate and respond to shifts in the character and location of population within a district's service area. Standard solutions such as building new permanent facilities are being augmented by more flexible arrangements using the latest technologies, including leasing satellite facilities, programmed learning packages, independent study, media (such as television and computer-assisted instruction), comprehensive learning resource centers that replace the traditional library, innovative approaches to counseling and guidance, "open colleges" and, indeed, college operations that may take place without any observable permanent physical facilities.

Colleges typically have operated with a campus and, more and more, a number of off-campus centers or satellites. It is possible also that an accredited college could operate without a campus in the traditional sense. Future delivery system selections likely will more often involve flexible community-

based arrangements and less often involve the traditional campus. Consequently, to be most useful to district governing boards, the minimum standards might well be such as to apply to a variety of planning decisions, including off-campus, as well as campus, operations. The specific standards have been developed within the foregoing framework.

Minimum standards for determining educational needs and preferences of a community, for example, would call for:

(a) projections of enrollment demand for the defined service area, taking into account projected and planned enrollments of nearby postsecondary institutions offering similar programs and services,

(b) projected manpower requirements in the designated service area and broader region, likewise taking into account possible manpower supply generated by the same set of nearby institutions, and

(c) the specifically identified college program and service preferences of individuals in the area to be serviced.

Board role

The Education Code is silent on the Board's role in formation of new colleges. While there is the requirement (being addressed by this item) that the Board prescribe minimum standards for the formation of a new college, there is no explicit provision for Board review, approval, comment, or other action with respect to a local board decision to form a new college. It is clear that authority for formation of a college rests with the governing board of the district in which it would be located.

Several factors suggest the logic of a definite Board role in this process. First, the Board is undertaking an annual planning process, focusing on development of a five-year plan (see Appendix A). Proposed new college operations might well highlight such a plan. The Education Code now provides that the Board:

> "shall review and approve academic master plans and master plans for facilities for each Community College district".

Formation of a new college would be part of such plans and, at least indirectly, therefore, subject to Board review and approval. The Board is also required to advise local boards on the selection and acquisition of new campus sites.

Second, the Board is required to review and approve programs and certain courses to be offered by Community College districts. Indeed, state funds may not be apportioned for such programs or courses unless approval has been secured.

Finally, the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) recently adopted procedures to carry out its legal responsibility to review proposed new campus and off-campus centers and advise the Legislature and Governor on the need for, and location of, same. While certain of the procedures appear beyond its legal authority, the Commission indicates it will expect Board of Governors "approval review" or all proposed new Community College campuses and certain off-campus centers.

The Commission has defined such off-campus centers subject to its review as "those planned for more than three years at a given location, and which (1) will offer courses in several certificate and/or degree programs, and/or (2) will have a head count enrollment of more than 500, and (3) will require funding for construction, acquisition, or lease. Those that will not require funding for construction, acquisition, or lease will be reported to the Commission for inventory and consideration for review." This definition appears to put CPEC into a position of reviewing district off-campus operations of a much smaller variety than appropriate even for Board review. In any event, the Board should be prepared with comment on such proposals.

Thus, while the Code is not explicit, a definite Board role is suggested in review and comment on formation of new Community Colleges campuses and off-campus centers (scope of the latter, however, as yet undefined). This role may take place most appropriately within the annual planning process (see again Appendix A), emphasize interdistrict concerns, and be implemented, it would appear, without legislation. This Board role should simply be consistent with the many other related Board responsibilities, including, among others, review and approval of district academic and facilities plans.

Proposed Regulations

A resolution of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges enacting Title 5 regulations on new Community Colleges.

Be it resolved by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, acting under the authority of Sections 193 and 22650 of the Education Code, and implementing, interpreting, and making specific 22650 of the Education Code, and pursuant to the Administrative Procedures Act, regulations in Title 5 of the California Administrative Code are added, amended, or repealed as follows:

First--Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 51800) is added to Division 3; Part VI of Title 5 to read as follows.

Chapter 10. New Colleges

Section 51800. Responsibilities of boards of trustees: A Community College board of trustees planning the formation of a new college to be operated under the jurisdiction of the district, shall, as required by Section 22650 of the Education Code, employ the following standards.

Section 51802. Definition of college. As used in this chapter, "college" means a degree-granting institution intended to provide

instruction through the fourteenth grade, including but not limited to one or more of the following categories: a) standard collegiate courses for transfer to higher institutions; b) vocational and technical fields leading to employment; or c) general or liberal arts courses and for which institution the district intends to obtain accreditation.

Section 51804. Assessment of Needs and Preferences.

A. The community area and character of individuals to be served should be adequately identified.

B. Projections of potential enrollment demand in the service area should demonstrate significant unmet future need, taking into account plans of nearby secondary and postsecondary institutions.

C. Significant community support should be evident.

D. Preferences for Community College programs and services on the part of individuals in the service area should be identified.

E. Present and future labor market requirements for trained manpower should be identified for the proposed service area, a broader adjacent region, the state, and society in general.

F Projected manpower requirements and community program preferences should be reconciled, if possible.

Section 51806. Objectives.

A. Proposed college programs and services should be directed to the identified educational needs and preferences of the community to be served.

B. Objectives of the proposed college programs and services should be sufficiently specific that the district board may evaluate the success with which needs and preferences are met.

Section 51808. Delivery Systems.

A. The proposed operation should be the most effective and equitable of feasible delivery system alternatives for providing intended programs and services.

B. Criteria for selecting the proposed delivery system should include

(1) accessibility of programs and services to all individuals in the service area.

(2) content and quality of programs and services, and

(3) cost of programs and services.

C. Depending on the delivery system proposed, alternatives for providing the proposed programs and services should include, but need not be limited to:

(1) increased utilization of existing district resources,

(2) forming a new college, campus, off-campus center, and/or outreach satellite(s), and/or

(3) use of media such as television, computer-assisted instruction or programmed learning packages.

Alternative delivery systems considered should be adequately decribed, generally mutually exclusvie, and limited to a manageable number to facilitate analysis and review.

D. Proposed sources of funding for needed resources should be identified for both short and long-term operations.

Second--These regulations mandate no new or added cost to local government within the meaning of Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2231 as they apply only to Community College districts and are permissive in nature.

APPENDIX A

PROPOSED STATE-LEVEL ROLE IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE PLANNING*

Summary

This paper presents a proposed state-level role in Community College planning, discussing specifically (a) the rationale and primary issues in Community College planning, (b) a possible state-level planning process, and (c) the possible content and use of a comprehensive five-year Community College plan for California.

Aside from the changing environment in which planning for colleges is being undertaken, there are several important procedural issues in defining a state-level role.

State-level planning efforts should provide adequately for input from districts and colleges, along with state and federal agencies. Likewise, while specific district and college planning efforts should begin locally, identifying community needs and preferences, there should be procedures for appropriate state-level review and assistance in this process.

State-level Community College planning must be effectively coordinated with activities of several other state-level agencies, such as the California Postsecondary Education Commission, Department of Finance, and Department of Education.

The planning process needs to be useful for both state-level and local college management activities if it is to warrant the allocation of staff and other resources required for its conduct.

Effective comprehensive planning requires a mechanism for bringing together the usually separate efforts of academic, occupational, facilities, finance, and access planning.

Due to the many complexities involved, the first comprehensive five-year plan likely will be somewhat condensed and the first-year planning process somewhat abbreviated as compared to efforts in future years.

*Based on paper presented at February 19-20, 1975 meeting of Board of Governors, California Community Colleges.

Rationale: Reasons for Planning

Planning is typically future-oriented, identifies goals and objectives, and selects the means to achieve same. Consequently, it should ease some of the problems of college management. With an adequate plan, new procedures or programs are not needed to solve problems arising from each new situation. Planning should also ease the problems of securing scarce public funding. Thoughtful consideration of alternative allocation of resources to accomplish agreed-upon objectives should provide better arguments in the competition for public support when education is under increasing question, when there are new and increasing other demands for public funding, and when inflation exists in all sectors.

Planning also provides the basis for determining how well we are doing; i.e., evaluation of performance or results, and should answer demands for "accountability." The process focuses on objectives and purposes. As a result, educators are required to identify the present and future educational preferences of individuals in communities and to forecast the future educational needs of individuals. Thus, Community Colleges are virtually forced to plan due to the nature of their educational service: they provide educational opportunities, training and development of individuals, the results of which accrue over a lifetime. In this context, they need to look 5, 10, 20 years and longer down the road to anticipate as nearly as possible the educational training from which individuals and society can best profit.

Issues in Community College Planning

Planning must shift from the emphasis of the 1960's of facilities to house spectacular growth to an emphasis during the next decade of increasing access through more effective and new delivery systems. Concern exists and will increase about meeting the needs of individuals who have not traditionally attended postsecondary education. Their needs must be met in ways other than only the traditional college campus, rigid two year calendars, and standard classroom lecture approach. As growth slows, there should be more concern with shifting demographics and specific character of subpopulations within a college's service area.

The comprehensive Community College concept needs to give way to a concept of comprehensive community-based college education. It is no longer only the college, but also a variety of other means that are used to provide educational services to the community. Other means include various media, neighborhood satellites, storefront operations, mobile units, and other kinds of limited purpose centers along with work experience, cooperative education, credit by examination or for extra-collegiate experience, and use of community library resources or any other useful and available off-campus facility. The Community College in effect becomes a community educational contractor, using its own campus plus any other community resource appropriate to meet its objectives.

Community College education needs to be directed to multiple adult roles, not only career education, but also to other adult roles (sometimes termed "whole person training"). Some enrollees are already trained and simply want to become better citizens, voters, and consumers. It is expected that future lifestyle changes will result in time spent by the average individual on vocational pursuits decreasing by one-third by the year 2000. There will be an increasing need for training in avocations and use of recreational and leisure time. General education is needed for the earlier assumption of adult roles by youngsters due to lowering the age-of-majority and earlier assumption of legal responsibilities and independence from parents.

College programs need more options in the time required and possible outcomes. Community College students have long since ceased to be the full-time, recent high school graduate, attending during the day. Seven of 10 in California attend part-time, working either part or full-time. At least one-fourth of all students are over thirty years of age. Many have limited objectives (some as little as one course), some are uncertain of their needs, and there are numerous "stop outs" who later return. It appears that only a minority of students undertake programs that resemble those contained in official college catalogs.

Planning must be comprehensive. Academic, facilities, occupational, fiscal, and access planning must be conducted simultaneously for effective allocation and distribution of college resources. Traditionally, academic planning dealt with outcomes, fiscal and facilities planning with resources and inputs, and access had to do with the distribution of opportunities. Seldom were the several efforts conducted together, and as a result effective decisions were made more by intuition and accident than by design. In addition, state, regional, and local planning needs to be integrated so that local planning is responsive to community needs and preferences but at the same time consistent with overall state objectives.

In particular, planning at the state-level Chancellor's Office and for the Board of Governors needs to tie academic, student, and facilities planning together with occupational planning and apportionments and budgeting. In addition, the planning process should be one that provides useful input to administration of program review and approval responsibilities of the Office and not just another chore of dubious value. The planning needs to be useful as well in working with other state and federal-level agencies and local districts and colleges. In particular, the planning process needs to reflect the existing differentiation of function between state and local agencies in planning and managing California Community Colleges. The Education Code charges the Board of Governors with general responsibility for "leadership and direction in the continuing development of Community Colleges ... maintaining and continuing, to the maximum degree permissible, local autonomy and control in the administration of Community Colleges.

the Board of Governors with general responsibility for "leadership and direction in the continuing development of Community Colleges ... maintaining and continuing, to the maximum degree permissible, local autonomy and control in the administration of Community Colleges.

Planning Process: General

The focus of a possible planning process would be the development of a comprehensive five-year plan by a Chancellor's Office Task Force each spring. The task force would analyze all relevant information, including district plans, program and budget proposals, forecasts of needs, and stated goals and objectives. Short-term and long-term problems would be identified and highlighted and solutions and policy directions recommended. This plan could be presented to the Board of Governors each June for approval as a preliminary document.

During the late summer, early fall, other state-level agencies, interest groups, and local districts would have the opportunity to comment upon the preliminary plan. At the same time the plan could form the basis for negotiations with the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), Department of Finance, and other agencies on specific proposals. Responses to the Preliminary Plan and results of negotiations could then be used for possible revision of the document. It would then be submitted to the Board for approval and use as a final document at the end of the year.

Planning Process: Timing

January	Chancellor's Office Task Force takes relevant information, analyzes with help of Technical/Advisory Committee, and develops comprehensive 5-year plan for California Community
May	Colleges.
June	Preliminary version of plan is presented to Board of Governors for approval.
July	Preliminary Plan submitted to other state-level agencies, and distributed to interest groups and Districts and Colleges.
August September	Response to Preliminary Plan made by other state-level agencies, interest groups, Districts and Colleges.
October November	Revision of Preliminary Plan as appropriate based upon response and results of negotiations with other state-level agencies.
December	Revised plan presented to Board for approval. Approved Final Plan is distributed to same agencies.
January	Next planning round is initiated by Task Force, beginning with Final Plan from prior round.

Planning Process: Participants

Efforts are initiated by a Chancellor's Office Planning Task Froce made up of Deans, Chiefs, or comparable level position from each of the operating areas:

Technical Advisory Committee (made up of persons from Districts, Colleges, and possibly state-level agencies) would provide suggestions, technical advice, comments, and assist in plan development.

The Chancellor's Office Executive Staff would review progress and Cabinet would review and give final approval to preliminary and final proposals.

Usual review and advice would be provided by Presidents/Superintendents and Chancellor's Advisory Committee during preliminary plan development. In addition, Districts and Colleges and others would have opportunity in July, August, September and October to review and comment upon Preliminary Plan.

Planning Process: Use

The Plan would contain recommended policy directions and solutions to short-term and long-term problems of high priority. The Plan could provide the basis for the Board's legislative, capital outlay, and finance programs. It also could be used for administration of Chancellor's Office apportionments, capital outlay, vocational education allocations, extended opportunity programs and services, credentialing, and academic program review and approval responsibilities. The Plan should discharge responsibility to CPEC and assist districts and colleges in their own planning and budgeting efforts.

Content of Plan

The content of the plan could be indicative of the activities of the Task Force and Technical Advisory Committee, including for example: discussion of background, policy summary, needs assessment, goals and objectives, delivery systems, and evaluation.

Background

Organization, intent, and uses of plan are specified. Planning process is explained in context of differentiation of college planning and management between state agencies and local districts.

Policy summary

This section identifies short-term and long-term problems of highest priority and discusses possible solutions. Policy directions for short-term (1976-77) and long-term (1977-1981) are recommended.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

AUG 8 1975

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Needs Assessment

Needs assessment includes evaluation of past and present success (or lack thereof) in achieving Community College goals and objectives (see further discussion below). Also presented are analyses of present and future trends in (a) Community College enrollment demand; (b) character of individual and community preferences for college educational services; (c) manpower, labor market requirements; and (d) general societal conditions, including migration patterns, division of time between vocation, avocation, recreation, and leisure.

Goals and Objectives

Goals and specific objectives of comprehensive community-based college operations in California are discussed. These may be derived from the general college mission to provide educational services, specifically training for technical and/or para or subprofessional occupations, pretraining for professional occupations, general education, and community educational services. In general, goals and objectives are either (a) output, (b) process, or (c) access-oriented. Both state and local goals and objectives are developed for the Board, Chancellor's Office, and Community Colleges generally. These should be framed in context of (a) higher level goals for all California public services and (b) federal/state/local goals.

Delivery systems

Program and resource organization, management and utilization is discussed. Elements of required district academic, facility, EOPS plans are summarized by district, region, and program. District and college "profiles" could be incuded. Present and future trends in educational delivery systems such as teaching and counseling technologies and organization of programs in outreach centers are analyzed for relevance to Community Colleges.

Presents utilization and need for staff, facilities, and other recources used in college operations; also resource acquisition: trends in financing and sources of income for capital and operating budgets; issues such as fees, state/local sharing of public support, federal funding are analyzed.

Evaluation

Presents results of recent studies and evaluations (such as COPES, EOPS, accreditations) that bear upon college performance, i.e., success in achieving objectives outlined in earlier section. General criteria used to evaluate success are "resource allocation": Are we providing the right kind of services in a technically efficient fashion? And "resource distribution": Are our services accessible to all individuals in the community who might profit therefrom? Discusses strategy for future evaluations of (a) success in meeting state-level and general college objectives and (b) results from the Plan's recommendations if implemented.